

## Colby's Record

*Editor:* On June 29, William E. Colby was pictured in *The Sun* endorsing a nuclear arms freeze. This is an issue with such serious ramifications that an examination of Mr. Colby's background with a view to assessing the endorsement seems appropriate.

Mr. Colby directed the CIA during the most tumultuous years of its existence, and in the view of his critics mishandled the onslaught against the agency in the mid-70s. In his book, "Facing Reality," for example, former senior CIA official Cord Meyer, whose column now appears in *The Evening Sun*, described Mr. Colby as guilty of "atrociously bad judgment and appalling naivete" in his dealings with a *New York Times* reporter, Seymour Hersh. The resulting inaccurate story in the *Times* seriously damaged the agency in the view of the critics.

More recently Mr. Colby was the subject of Justice Department action when a French edition of his book was printed without its having undergone the required agency clearance.

Mr. Colby, who ran CIA operations in Vietnam prior to becoming director, has been criticized for the 40,000 Hanoi agents who were later found to have infiltrated the South Vietnamese government and military. American lives were lost, it is claimed, owing to Mr. Colby's neglect of counterintelligence.

In public, Mr. Colby has displayed a narrow conception of what constitutes a national security threat, which he has described as "an enemy fleet off our shores."

This background should be factored in when weighing Mr. Colby's endorsement for a nuclear freeze.

Henry Rosin.

Chestertown.

ARTICLE APPEARED  
ON PAGE 28A

PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER  
15 JULY 1982

## Letters to the editor

### CIA has the techniques

# Freeze verification is doable

To the Editor:

Richard Burt, a senior State Department official, said at a European news conference last week that the Soviets had added 45 warheads to their SS-20 missiles during the past five months. Alexander Haig, just a few days before his departure as secretary of state, described an intricate series of missile test-firings that the Soviets had conducted during a two-week period in early June.

In both cases, the purpose of these revelations was publicly to expose Soviet actions as contrary to world peace.

But they also reveal something else that is terribly important: The United States knows, in rather precise detail, what the Soviets are doing. So, while it often is said that we can't trust the Soviets, it seems appropriate to respond: We don't have to. Through technical means, such as satellites, each side can — and does — watch very closely what the other side is doing. Each knows, with confidence, the nuclear capacity of the other side — right down to the number, size and location of warheads. That's significant.

William Colby, former CIA director, made this point on July 1, when he endorsed the proposal for an immediate freeze of the nuclear arms race. Mr. Colby, who knows a great deal about such things, said that a freeze

would pose "no significant danger of undetected Soviet cheating." In fact, he stated that the freeze would make it easier, rather than more difficult, to control Soviet behavior, since it would place clear, unambiguous limits on what they (and we) are permitted to do. As things presently stand, there are no rules — no limits, no treaties — governing the arms race.

While noting that no verification technique ever can be totally foolproof, Mr. Colby stated that to cheat on the freeze agreement, without detection, would be immensely difficult and only temporary. And whatever might be produced through such elaborate deception, he said, would be of only marginal value — certainly not enough significantly to endanger U.S. security, and not worth the damage that eventual exposure surely would bring.

The nuclear arms freeze would require exactly the same thing of both sides: an immediate stop to all new nuclear weapons.

Then, negotiations could focus entirely on how to get rid of the massive overkill that already exists. Verification would, of course, be of great importance, and both sides have the means to verify, with a high degree of confidence, that the other side is complying.

So, where does the freeze proposal stand? The Soviets indicat-

ed a willingness to consider it as a first step in the arms reduction (START) talks which began June 29. The U.S. government has rejected the idea, saying that it is necessary to proceed with our planned nuclear buildup first.

The recent outcry against nuclear arms has demonstrated the enormous power of public opinion. A halt to the arms race can be achieved, but only through individuals — one by one — joining together in responsible protest, gradually becoming a truth-force that cannot be ignored.

Voters in New Jersey (and probably Philadelphia) will have that opportunity this November, when the freeze will appear as a question on their ballots. Others may sign the freeze petition being circulated in churches, shopping centers and other public places.

Some people say that any agreement with the Soviets is too risky and that building more and better nuclear weapons is the only way to be secure. But how and when will that process eventually end? Will there be some safer time than now to stop? The truth is that every path has risks, but none is riskier than the buildup path we presently are on.

To freeze now is the most realistic — and necessary — thing to do.

TOM O'ROURKE  
Philadelphia.

ARTICLE APPEARED  
ON PAGE 11

THE NEWSDAY MAGAZINE (N.Y.)  
11 July 1982

# Bill Casey at the Helm: Quietly in Control

By David Wise  
Photo by Ken Spencer

Some weeks ago, an interesting piece of information began circulating in the intelligence community — the closed, spooky world of the Central Intelligence Agency, Defense Intelligence Agency, National Security Agency, Federal Bureau of Investigation and the other spy agencies in and around Washington.

The word went out that William J. Casey, the director of central intelligence, had bought an expensive house in the exclusive Foxhall Road section of Washington.

To men and women accustomed to working with fragments, piecing together minute bits of intelligence to form a larger mosaic, the report was immediately seen for its true significance. Better than any official announcement, it meant that Bill Casey, a Long Islander who has a home in Roslyn Harbor, was planning to stick around as CIA director.

There have been times in the past stormy year and a half when it was not at all clear that Casey would survive as the DCI, as the spies refer to their chief. There was a series of disasters. First, Casey named his former political aide, Max C. Hugel, as head of the CIA's cloak-and-dagger directorate. Hugel was soon forced to resign as the result of disclosures in the Washington Post about his questionable business dealings. Then the Senate Intelligence Committee, responding to a barrage of publicity, began probing Casey's own financial past. And Sen. Barry Goldwater, chairman of the intelligence committee, once a Republican presidential nominee and still an influential

point-blank for Casey to resign.

All of that took place last year, Casey's first year on the job. The storm subsided. The Senate panel, in a backhanded way, found Casey not "unfit" to serve. And through it all, the CIA director — Ronald Reagan's campaign manager in 1980 — managed to preserve his close personal relationship with the President. ("I still call him Ronnie," Casey has said.)

Among those who must surely have heard the report about the house off Foxhall Road was Casey's deputy, Adm. Bobby Ray Inman, who Sen. Goldwater and a lot of other members of Congress had openly hoped would be Reagan's original choice for CIA director. Blocked from the top job, wooed by private industry with job offers in six figures, Inman in April announced that he was quitting.

In Moscow, the KGB has no doubt already heard about Casey's new house. Very likely, Vitali V. Fedorchuk, the recently appointed chairman of the Committee for State Security, better known as the KGB, has already informed President Leonid Brezhnev in the Kremlin.

And the report is true. J. William Doswell, director of the CIA's Office of External Affairs, a smooth, Richmond, Va., lobbyist and former newsman whom Casey brought in as his top public relations man, confirms it. Doswell said that Casey and his wife, Sophia, moved last month from their apartment somewhere in Washington to their new home off Foxhall Road.

career who has managed to stay one jump ahead of trouble, barely avoiding entanglement with the likes of Robert Vesco during Watergate. For example, Sen. Joe Biden of Delaware, a Democrat on the Senate Intelligence Committee and Casey's most vocal critic, refused to endorse the panel's findings on the CIA director, declaring: "Mr. Casey has displayed a consistent pattern of omissions, misstatements, and contradictions." And Casey's critics also charge he is not really qualified to run the CIA, since his intelligence experience dates from World War II, when he worked for the Office of Strategic Services (the OSS was the